

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEBRASKA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

vs.

MICHAEL A. PARIS,

Defendant.

4:24CR3086

ORDER

Plaintiff has moved to continue the conference call, (Filing No. 105), because Plaintiff will be in trial on another matter on the current setting. The motion to continue is unopposed. Based on the showing set forth in the motion, the court finds good cause has been shown and the motion should be granted. Accordingly,

IT IS ORDERED:

- 1) Plaintiff's motion to continue, (Filing No. 105), is granted.
- 2) The conference call previously scheduled to be held on August 11, 2025, is continued. A telephonic conference with counsel will be held before the undersigned magistrate judge at 10:00 a.m. on August 20, 2025 to discuss setting any pretrial motion hearing needed, a change of plea hearing, or the date of the jury trial and deadlines for disclosing experts as required under Rule 16. Counsel for all parties shall use the conferencing instructions provided by the court to participate in the call.
- 3) The court finds that the ends of justice served by granting the motion to continue outweigh the interests of the public and the defendants in a speedy trial, and the additional time arising as a result of the granting of the motion, the time between today's date and August 20, 2025 shall be deemed excludable time in any computation of time under the requirements of the Speedy Trial Act, because although counsel have been duly diligent, additional time is needed to adequately prepare this case for trial and failing to grant additional time might result in a miscarriage of justice and, further, as failure to grant the motion would deny counsel for the defendant or the attorney for the Government the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(1), (h)(6) & (h)(7). Failing to timely object to this order as provided under this court's local rules will be deemed a waiver of any right to later claim the time should not have been excluded under the Speedy Trial Act.

Dated this 8th day of August, 2025.

BY THE COURT:

s/ Jacqueline M. DeLuca
United States Magistrate Judge